

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 through 32 are pending in the Application.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

The Office Action rejected claims 1 through 32 under U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,490,297 to Kraml et al. (the Kraml reference). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) because the references applied to the claims fail to disclose each element of the claims, as explained below. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. . . . The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. M.P.E.P. 2131.

The Office Action states in paragraph 2 that “The claims as currently written perform no function other than channel hopping.” This statement does not reflect aspects of the embodiments described in the specification and the claims. As stated in paragraphs 9-11 of the specification, a wireless transceiver (e.g., the client station) is required to occasionally scan the available channels to see whether there are other nodes with which to communicate (i.e., other channels are supporting data of interest to the wireless communication device). Because of the nature of wireless networks, the scanning process requires that the station to temporarily leave the channel that is supporting a current communication by tuning and listening to one or more different channels to determine if there is any interest in association with one of these other channels. A significant period of time is required to make such a determination for each channel. In many wireless local area networks (WLAN), multiple frequencies and/or network interface protocols may be used (e.g., IEEE 802.11b, IEEE 802.11a, and/or IEEE 802.11g protocols), which increases the number of channels that must be scanned and correspondingly increases the time it takes to scan all of the channels. While the time it takes to scan multiple channels over multiple network interface protocols, the data throughput performance impact on the station is modest. However, the data throughput for higher layer protocols, such as Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) may be significantly impacted. Such a significant impact results because TCP/IP measures the time that expires from when a source sends a packet to a

destination until the source receives an acknowledgement (ACK) from the destination that it received the packet. If the time is greater than expected (e.g., a few hundred milliseconds plus some tolerance that accounts for reasonable transmission time variations), TCP/IP may interpret this as congestion (i.e., the network infrastructure is overworked and is slow in transferring packets). If the station is scanning other channels for a significant period of time (e.g., a few hundred milliseconds), TCP/IP may view this absence of support as congestion and evoke the multiplicative decrease congestion avoidance algorithm. As such, the TCP/IP throughput is unnecessarily reduced.

Certain embodiments of the invention address this problem. In one embodiment, a scan channel request is received of a plurality of channels that are in accordance with the network interface protocol. For example, the channels may be in accordance with IEEE 802.11a, IEEE 802.11b, and/or IEEE 802.11g or other protocol. The method then continues by determining whether an Internet packet is being received via one of the plurality of channels when the channel scan request is received (i.e., is a higher layer protocol supporting a current transmission). If so, the method continues by scanning at least one channel of the plurality of channels, but does not scan all of the plurality of channels at one time. The method continues after the scanning by tuning to the channel supporting the higher layer protocol communication to transmit at least one outbound Internet packet. The method then continues by scanning at least another channel of the plurality of channels.

**Independent Claim 1 and Dependent Claims 2 through 7**

The Office Action has failed to show that the Kraml reference discloses the elements, *inter alia*, of claim 1 of, “when the Internet packet is being received when the channel scan request is received, wherein each of the plurality of channels have a different associated radio frequency (RF) signal; scanning at least one other channel of the plurality of channels, but less than all of the plurality of channels; after scanning the at least one other channel, tuning to the one of the plurality of channels and transmitting at least one outbound Internet packet; and scanning at least another channel of the plurality of channels.”

The Office Action cites column 6, lines 15 through 35 of the Kraml reference as disclosing all the elements of claim 1. However, this citation of the Kraml reference fails to

disclose the elements of claim 1. The Kraml reference with respect to Figure 2, states at column 6, lines 15 through 35:

“At a step 112, the component controller 18 initializes the communication application stored in the component memory 20, and waits for the application to initialize for a predetermined time period "T". At a test 114, the component controller 18 then determines whether the communication application properly initialized at step 112. If the communication application successfully initializes within the time period T, then at a step 116 the component controller 18 executes the communication application and execution of the control program ends. If, on the other hand, the communication application does not properly initialize within the time period T, it is likely that the application may require additional control signals for proper initialization. Accordingly, at a step 118 the component controller 18 scans the communication link channels to identify additional channels and to thus receive the additional control signals before returning to test 104. Preferably the control signal carried by the signaling channel identified at step 102, as well as the additional control signals, include the identification code that specifies possible additional signaling channels to the component controller 18 so that, at step 118, the component controller 18 need only scan those signaling channels specified by the identification code.”

The Kraml reference describes the communication application at column 4, lines 24 through 29 stating that:

“The system component 16 also includes a component memory 20 for storing a communication application, such as a cellular telephone service provider module, that may be executed by the component controller 18 when communication between the system component 16 and the system controller 12 is established.”

The Kraml reference thus only describes scanning the communication link channels to identify additional signaling channels when a communication application does not properly initialize

within a time period T. The Kraml reference nowhere discusses when an Internet packet is being received or when a channel scan request is received. There is no discussion of scanning a plurality of channels or determining whether a packet is being received by a channel or scanning at least one but less than all of the channels and tuning to the one of the channels to transmit the packet. As such, the Kraml reference fails to disclose, *inter alia*, the elements of claim 1 of, “when the Internet packet is being received when the channel scan request is received, wherein each of the plurality of channels have a different associated radio frequency (RF) signal; scanning at least one other channel of the plurality of channels, but less than all of the plurality of channels; after scanning the at least one other channel, tuning to the one of the plurality of channels and transmitting at least one outbound Internet packet; and scanning at least another channel of the plurality of channels.”

The dependent claims 2 through 7 add further patentable matter to Claim 1 and thus are further differentiated and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102 over the Kraml reference.

**Independent Claim 8 and Dependent Claims 9 through 13**

The Office Action has failed to show that the Kraml reference discloses the elements, *inter alia*, of claim 8 of, “when a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) connection is established between a source and a destination, receiving a network interface protocol channel scan request; and when the network interface protocol channel scan request is received, hopping between a channel supporting the TCP connection within a wireless local area network (WLAN) having an associated radio frequency (RF) signal and other channels of the WLAN having other associated RF signals and transmitting on the channel supporting the TCP connection to avoid excess latency in acknowledging receipt of a packet formatted in accordance with the Internet Protocol or a portion of the packet during scanning of the other channels of the WLAN.”

The Office Action cites column 6, lines 15 through 35 of the Kraml reference as disclosing all the elements of claim 8. However, these citations of the Kraml reference only describe scanning the communication link channels to identify additional signaling channels when a communication application does not properly initialize within a time period T. As explained with respect to claim 1, this disclosure does not disclose the elements of claim 8. The

dependent claims 9 through 13 add further patentable matter to Claim 8 and thus are further differentiated and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102 over the Kraml reference.

**Independent Claim 14 and Dependent Claims 15 through 19**

The Office Action has failed to show that the Kraml reference discloses the elements, *inter alia*, of claim 14 of, “memory operably coupled to the processing module, wherein the memory stores operational instructions that cause the processing module to: process data in accordance with an utility application to produce a message; process the message in accordance with a transport application to produce a packet; process the packet in accordance with an Internet Protocol to produce at least one of the datagram; generate a channel scan request in accordance with the transport application; determine whether one of the datagrams is being received when the channel scan request is generated; when the one of the datagrams is being received when the channel scan request is received, scan at least one other channel of the plurality of channels, but less than all of the plurality of channels; after scanning the at least one other channel, tune to the one of the plurality of channels and transmitting at least one outbound datagram; and scanning at least another channel of the plurality of channels.”

The Office Action cites column 6, lines 15 through 35 of the Kraml reference as disclosing all the elements of claim 14. However, these citations of the Kraml reference only describe scanning the communication link channels to identify additional signaling channels when a communication application does not properly initialize within a time period T. As explained with respect to claim 1, this disclosure does not disclose the elements of claim 14. The dependent claims 15 through 19 add further patentable matter to Claim 14 and thus are further differentiated and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102 over the Kraml reference.

**Independent Claim 20 and Dependent Claims 21 through 23**

The Office Action has failed to show that the Bendinelli reference discloses the elements, *inter alia*, of claim 20 of, “memory operably coupled to the processing module, wherein the memory stores operational instructions that cause the processing module to: process data in accordance with an utility application to produce a message; process the message in accordance with a transport application to produce a packet; process the packet in accordance with an

Internet Protocol to produce at least one of the datagram; generate a channel scan request in accordance with the transport application; determine whether one of the datagrams is being received when the channel scan request is generated; when the one of the datagrams is being received when the channel scan request is received, scan at least one other channel of the plurality of channels, but less than all of the plurality of channels; after scanning the at least one other channel, tune to the one of the plurality of channels and transmitting at least one outbound datagram; and scanning at least another channel of the plurality of channels.”

The Office Action cites column 6, lines 15 through 35 of the Kraml reference as disclosing all the elements of claim 20. However, these citations of the Kraml reference only describes scanning the communication link channels to identify additional signaling channels when a communication application does not properly initialize within a time period T. As explained with respect to claim 1, this disclosure does not disclose the elements of claim 20. The dependent claims 21 through 23 add further patentable matter to Claim 20 and thus are further differentiated and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102 over the Kraml reference.

**Independent Claim 24 and dependent Claims 25 through 28**

The Office Action has failed to show that the Bendinelli reference discloses the elements, *inter alia*, of claim 24 of, “memory operably coupled to the processing module, wherein the memory stores operational instructions that cause the processing module to: receive a channel scan request in accordance with a transport application; determine whether one of the datagrams is being received by one of a plurality of channels when the channel scan request is generated, wherein each of the plurality of channels has an associated radio frequency (RF) signal; when the one of the datagrams is being received when the channel scan request is received, scan at least one other channel of the plurality of channels, but less than all of the plurality of channels; after scanning the at least one other channel, tune to the one of the plurality of channels and transmitting at least one outbound datagram; and scanning at least another channel of the plurality of channels.”

The Office Action cites column 6, lines 15 through 35 of the Kraml reference as disclosing all the elements of claim 24. However, these citations of the Kraml reference only describes scanning the communication link channels to identify additional signaling channels

when a communication application does not properly initialize within a time period T. As explained with respect to claim 1, this disclosure does not disclose the elements of claim 24. The dependent claims 25 through 28 add further patentable matter to Claim 24 and thus are further differentiated and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102 over the Bendinelli reference.

**Independent Claim 29 and dependent Claims 30 through 32**

The Office Action has failed to show that the Bendinelli reference discloses the elements, *inter alia*, of claim 29 of, “memory operably coupled to the processing module, wherein the memory stores operational instructions that cause the processing module to: when a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) connection is established between a source and a destination, receive a network interface protocol channel scan request; and when the network interface protocol channel scan request is received, hop between a channel having a first radio frequency supporting the TCP connection within a wireless local area network (WLAN) and other channels of the WLAN having other radio frequencies and transmitting on the channel supporting the TCP connection to avoid excess latency in acknowledging receipt of a datagram of the at least one datagrams or a portion of the datagram during scanning of the other channels of the WLAN.”

The Office Action cites column 6, lines 15 through 35 of the Kraml reference as disclosing all the elements of claim 29. However, these citations of the Kraml reference only describes scanning the communication link channels to identify additional signaling channels when a communication application does not properly initialize within a time period T. As explained with respect to claim 1, this disclosure does not disclose the elements of claim 29. The dependent claims 30 through 32 add further patentable matter to Claim 29 and thus are further differentiated and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102 over the Kraml reference.

**Reply Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 – Expedited Procedure**

Serial No.: 10/633,242

Examiner: Jeffrey R. Swearingen

**CONCLUSION**

For the above reasons, the foregoing response places the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact Jessica Smith at (972) 240-5324.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON

Dated: November 24, 2008

/Jessica W. Smith/

Jessica W. Smith

Reg. No. 39,884

Garlick, Harrison & Markison  
P.O. Box 160727  
Austin, TX 78716-0727  
Phone: (972) 240-5324  
Fax: (469) 366-6731